

(b) Recommendation to Central Government has been made for abolition of Teachers' Constituencies on 20th July 1978 and of Graduates' Constituencies on 25th July 1978.

The reason for making recommendation to Central Government was that the Central Government requested for opinion in respect of the Teachers' Constituencies. The State Government took a decision in respect of both the Constituencies.

(c) There will be no change in the constitution position.

(d) As the views have recently been communicated to Government of India, its opinion (if any) is awaited.

Alleged ill-treatment to the High Court Judge

ಶ್ರೀ ಹಾರ್ಡಹಳ್ಳಿ ರಾಮಸ್ವಾಮಿ (ಗಂಡಸಿ).—ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಗಮನ ಸೆಳೆಯುವ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ೬ ದಿವಸಗಳ ಹಿಂದೆಯೇ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ತಮ್ಮ ಕುಂದುಕೊರತೆ ಏನಿದೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಬರೆದು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿ ನಾನು ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಹಾರ್ಡಹಳ್ಳಿ ರಾಮಸ್ವಾಮಿ.—ನಾನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕೆಂದಿರುವ ವಿಷಯವಾದರೂ ಏನು ಇದೆ ಅದನ್ನಾದರೂ ಕೇಳಿ. ಈ ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಉಚ್ಚ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಲಯದಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಒಬ್ಬ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಧೀಶರಿಗೆ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕವಾಗಿ ಅಗೌರವ ತೋರಿಸಿರುವಂತಹ ವಿಷಯ ನಾನು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅದೂ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲೂ ಕೂಡ ಬಂದಿದೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ತಮ್ಮ ಗಮನ ಸೆಳೆಯುವ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ್ದೆ. ಅದು ಖಾಸಗಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮ, ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿ ಇಲ್ಲ ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರಿಂದ ಉತ್ತರ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಹಾರ್ಡಹಳ್ಳಿ ರಾಮಸ್ವಾಮಿ.—ಈ ವಿಷಯ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಬರಬೇಕೇ ಬೇಡವೇ ಅದು ಬೇರೆ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಏನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ ಅದನ್ನಾದರೂ ಹೇಳಲಿ, ತಾವು ದಯಮಾಡಿ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ತಾವು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ್ದ ಗಮನ ಸೆಳೆಯುವ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅದು ಖಾಸಗಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮ, ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿ ಇಲ್ಲ ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರಿಂದ ಉತ್ತರ ಬಂದಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಈಗ ತಾವು ಆ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯೇ ಉದ್ಭವಿಸುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

SRI C. M. ARUMUGHAM (KGF).—Sir, I am not saying against your ruling. But you will have to kindly allow him to make a statement. A public function is different from an official function. These politicians attend any type of function—public function or unofficial function. But officials are expected to attend only official functions. If in an official function or non-official function, any person belonging to any community is dishonoured and is not respected simply because he belongs to a particular caste, I submit this is the place where we have to raise the issue. Where else shall we go? He said: Ministers are Ministers for 24 hours. A senior Judge of the

High Court is concerned. He is a sitting High Court Judge for the last 14 years and he is working in the judicial department for about 29 years. All his juniors have become Chief Justices. I do not know why this Government has not elevated him to that post. Simply because he belongs to a particular caste.....

MR. SPEAKER.—If the member wants any matter to be raised, he may please give notice. I will send it to the Government and get the information. Under what rule can the hon. member Sri C. M. Arumugham raise the subject-matter like this?

SRI C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—This involves the honour and prestige of the caste and community to which we belong. There are 34 M.L.A.s belonging to Scheduled Castes. If they are not respected in a public function why should we come here? For 2,000 and odd years we have been degraded and asked to do dirty jobs. If a High Court Judge.....

MR. SPEAKER.—Then he may please send a notice.

SRI C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—Why should I send? Any dishonour to a High Court Judge is dishonour to the public. I am not going to tolerate any dishonour. I take strong objection for dishonouring a senior Judge of a High Court. The organisers did not mention his name in the welcome address; he was not garlanded.

SRI K. H. RANGANATH (Minister for Agriculture and Parliamentary Affairs).—I came to know that hon. Member Sri Ramaswamy has given a notice of it and you were pleased to say something. I have also not looked into it. The hon. member has raised the issue by sending a notice the Hon. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER.—All of a sudden he cannot raise it.

SRI K. H. RANGANATH.—He had sent a notice. I do not know whether you have looked into the notice and called for information and all those things. If you were to kindly pass on the notice we would also look into it and whatever information is necessary, we will get it, and then the matter may be taken up.

ಶ್ರೀ ಹಾರ್ಡ್‌ಹೈ ರಾಮಸ್ವಾಮಿ.—ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಣ್ಣಪುಟ್ಟ ವಿಷಯಗಳಿಗೆಲ್ಲಾ ದಿವಸಗಟ್ಟಲೆ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗಿದೆ. ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಉಚ್ಚ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಲಯದ ಒಬ್ಬ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಧೀಶರನ್ನು ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕವಾಗಿ ಅವಮಾನ ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ವಿಷಯ. ಮತ್ತು ಆ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಜರಿದ್ದ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳೂ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ನಡೆಯಿತೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಏನು ತೊಂದರೆ ಇದೆ? ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಇದು ಬಹಳ ಪ್ರಾಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ವಿಷಯ. ನಿಮ್ಮವರ್ಗದ ಹಾಗೂ ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಉಚ್ಚ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಲಯದ ಒಬ್ಬ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಧೀಶರನ್ನು ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕವಾಗಿ ಅವಮಾನ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಇದು ಪ್ರಾಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ವಿಷಯವಲ್ಲ, ಇದು ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಕುಬಂಧವಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದರೆ ಹೇಗೆ? ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳೂ ಕೂಡ ಆ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾಗವಹಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆದಂತಹ ವಿಷಯ ಏನು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇದು ರೂಲ್ ಓರ ಕೆಳಗೆ ಬರತಕ್ಕಂಥಹ ವಿಷಯ

ವಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರ ಹತ್ತಿರ ಮಾಹಿತಿ ಇದೆ. ಮಾಹಿತಿ ಇಲ್ಲ ಎಂದರೆ ನಾನು ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾಗವಹಿಸಿದ್ದಂತಹ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಸದಯಿತೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕವಾಗಿ ನಾವು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ತಾವು ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ತಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಮತ್ತೆ ಇಂತಹ ಪ್ರಮುಖವಾದ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಅನಾವಶ್ಯಕವಾಗಿ ಮುಂದೆ ಮುಕತಕ್ಕಂಥಾದ್ದು ನ್ಯಾಯವಲ್ಲ. ಹಾಗೇನಾದರೂ ತಪ್ಪು ತಡೆಗಳಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಏನು ಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯು ತಿಳಿಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಪೇಕ್ಷಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ನಿಮ್ಮ ವರ್ಗಗಳ ಬೆಂಬಲದ ಆಧಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ನಾವಿಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದು ಕುಳಿತಿದ್ದೇವೆ ; ಅವರ ಗೌರವ ರಕ್ಷಣೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ನಮ್ಮ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯವಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು, ಈ ವಿಷಯ ಕುರಿತು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ವತಿಯಿಂದ ಹೇಳಿಕೆ ಕೊಡಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ.

SRI C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—This is an issue which involves the prestige, the honour and dignity of the Scheduled Castes people of the State and it is not necessary that the House should take up the issue alone. It is the responsibility of the Government also. The Government cannot allow a Senior Judge of a High Court to be humiliated in that fashion. It also becomes an offence under the Civil Rights Act. Our Society is such that it is completely saturated with casteism, communalism and hatred to the depressed classes. If a Scheduled Caste person becomes a Governor, before welcoming him, they may even garland the A.D.C. first who happen to be a higher caste man. Mr. Ramaswamy has mentioned that the Hon'ble Law Minister is here. Let him also say what has happened.

SRI G. B. SHANKAR RAO.—I rise on a point of order. We are also as much agitated over this issue as our hon. friends Sri Ramaswamy or Sri Arumugham. I would like to submit that the Hon. Speaker admit the motion and pass it on to the Minister concerned, according to the Rules of Procedure.

SRI C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—He is making some sermon..... What rules are there ? I know how the rules have been followed.....

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ.ಬಿ ಶಂಕರರಾವ್. (ಹಿರಿಕರರಾರ್)— ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಆರ್ಮುಗಂ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಕಳಕಳಿ ಇದೆಯೋ ಅಷ್ಟೇ ಕಳಕಳಿ ನನಗೂ ಇದೆ. ಸಭಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಷಯ ಎತ್ತಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುವ ಪೂರ್ವದಲ್ಲಿ, ಈ ವಿಷಯದ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದು ನಿಯಮಕ್ಕನುಗುಣವಾಗಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಚಿವರಿಗೆ ಇದತ್ತು ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗದಿದ್ದರೆ ನಾಳೆ ಕೊಡಲಿ. ಅಷ್ಟ ರಲ್ಲಿ ಆಕಾಶ ಕಳಬೇಳುವುದೇನು ? Let the Hon. Minister for Parliamentary Affairs collect the full information and then furnish it to the House, and if anything more is required, then the Hon. Minister for Law who was also present on that occasion may make a statement. He can also supplement to the replies given by the Hon. Minister for Parliamentary Affairs tomorrow. ಆದುದರಿಂದ, ನಿಯಮಾವಳಿ ಬಿಟ್ಟು, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ರಾಮಸ್ವಾಮಿ ಮತ್ತು ಶ್ರೀ ಆರ್ಮುಗಂ ಅವರು ಸರ್ಕಾರದಿಂದ ಹೇಳಿಕೆ ಬಯಸಿದರೆ, ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣ ಮಾಹಿತಿ ದೊರೆಯಲಾರದೇನೋ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ.

SRI QUMARAL ISLAM (Gulbarga).—There was a communal riot in Kolar and some three mosques were destroyed. The minorities have

suffered a lot on account of this riot. I have already given a notice. How long will the Government take to give a reply?

MR. SPEAKER.— Without indicating one's inclination to speak, the Hon. Member has suddenly raised and spoken without my permission. Is it correct according to rules? He has to follow certain rules of procedure.

SRI QUMARAL ISLAM.— I have followed the rules. I have already given the notice. This is a zero Hour. Therefore, I am raising it. This is a matter of urgent public importance also.

MR. SPEAKER.— You cannot raise and speak without my permission.

SRI C.M. ARUMUGHAM.— Of course, my hon. Friend can also raise it after this issue is over. I have sent a letter about this matter and I got the reply also, i.e., matter under Rule 312.

MR. SPEAKER.— I have to get certain information. I will have to consult the Government. Therefore, after examining the matter, I will take it up tomorrow. If you want to make any statement or say something, that is different. But if the Minister wants some time to furnish the information, then what is to be done? Therefore I said, that the minister will collect the information and permit the member later.

SRI B. BASAVALINGAPPA (Minister for Revenue).— Now the Speaker is right in asking the Member to give a motion as per rules. It is good but it has been the precedent of this House that during Zero Hour, certain questions of importance may be raised and if the Hon. Minister is ready to answer, then that can be discussed by deviating the procedure of the House.

MR. SPEAKER.— Let us not deviate the procedure.

SRI B. BASAVALINGAPPA.— This has been the precedent for many many years. During the zero hour, if the concerned Minister is ready to answer, then we can permit the Hon. Member.

MR. SPEAKER.— That is not a healthy convention. That is why Zero Hour has been suspended and only in extra-ordinary circumstances, with the permission of the Chair, it can be allowed under Rule 312, abundant opportunities are available to the Hon. Members to raise the matter with the previous notice; otherwise, it will be very difficult to function.

SRI B. BASAVALINGAPPA.— We do not wish to go against the procedure. I don't think any hon. Member is willing to go against the procedure. But one thing I would like to mention. The Zero Hour is kept precious by all the Legislatures all over the country. Now during the Zero Hour

some important issue has been raised but they are required to give a Motion. But important issues can be raised if the Treasury Bench is ready to answer or give a reply on the spur of the moment. If the Hon. Minister for Law is ready to answer, because according to the speech of my hon. Friend Sri Arumugham, the Hon. Minister for Law was also present on that occasion, then that issue can be allowed to be raised.

MR. SPEAKER.—The Hon. Minister should also be given a reasonable opportunity to give reply. I will consult the Government and take up the matter:

ಶ್ರೀ ಹಾರಸಹಳ್ಳಿ ರಾಮಸ್ವಾಮಿ.—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ನಿಯಮಾವಳಿ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಉತ್ತರ ತಯಾರು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ತರದೇ ಇರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರ ಹತ್ತಿರ ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ವಿವರಗಳು ಇದ್ದರೆ ಹೇಳಿ ಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬಹುದೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

MR. SPEAKER.—This has to be answered by the Hon. Chief Minister Sri L. G. HAVANUR (Minister for Law, Social welfare and Backward Clases).—The file is marked to my department.

Alleged insult to Justice Sri K. Bhimaiah

SRI C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—The letter from the Legislative Secretariat reads thus.

“Subject: Subject matter under Rule 312 regarding insult shown to Mr. Justice K. Bhimaiah etc,

With reference to your notice of 19th on the above subject, I am directed to state that the Speaker regrets that he cannot admit the notice as there is no responsibility of Government involved in this matter.”

We have given notice about two weeks ago. Whether it involved the responsibility of Government or not, it involves the society. It is a matter of showing disrespect to a sitting and senior Judge. Therefore, this matter should be taken up. It is a deliberate insult. If it is a deliberate insult to a sitting senior Judge it reflects on the entire population and also on the members of the Scheduled Castes including the Minister. Is there any need for a Civil Rights Act? It is an act meant to take care of the people belonging to the Scheduled Castes. If any man says you cannot drink water from a public well, it comes under the Civil Rights Act. If any man says that certain sections of the society should not enter a temple, it comes under the Civil Rights Act. If any man says that you are an untouchable, it comes under this Act. This Act does not apply to others. It is exclusively meant for the ten crores of people of India belonging to the Scheduled Castes. The other laws enacted by the parliament and the legislatures

applies to one and all. Therefore, the act of the organisers at Holesnarsipur amounts to an insult to the community or to the caste to which Justice Bhimaiah belongs. We must take up the question as to why he was not respected. Though he is a Judge, He was not respected because he happens to belong to the Scheduled Castes. If a person is insulted simply because he belongs to a lower caste in the Hindu order of society, then it raises big issues. Government *suo mot* should have taken action and they need not have waited till the matter was raised on the floor of the House. The organisers have preplanned to insult and humiliate him. There is what is called protocol i.e. the order of respect according to the status of a person. If a Deputy Minister goes along with the Chief Minister to a function, the Chief Minister is garlanded first and then the Deputy Minister is garlanded. This is according to protocol. Likewise, if a senior Judge goes along with a junior Judge, the senior Judge should be respected first. This is according to protocol. In this function Justice Bhimaiah was the last man to be garlanded and that too it was a used garland. You cannot ask Justice Bhimaiah to come here and depose as to what happened there. Since he belongs to the cadre of judges, under the rules we cannot cast aspersions on the conduct of the Judges. But here this has happened to a sitting senior Judge. There are Ministers belonging to the Scheduled Castes, there are 34 M.L. As and Councillors in the Corporation belonging to the Scheduled Castes there is a Deputy Minister who is in charge of Defence. In spite of all these persons and in spite of the untouchability offence Act and the Civil Rights Act, still casteism is rampant, and this insult has happened to Justice Bhimaiah. This disrespect I take it is a disrespect to the 40 lakhs of Scheduled Caste people, to the 34 sitting M.L.As belonging to this caste, to Justice Bhimaiah, to Sri K.H. Ranganath, to Shri Havanur and others. Therefore, you have to consider what action should be taken.

SRI K.H. RANGANATH.— If I may express my personal opinion, it is a disrespect to the judiciary also.

SRI C.M. ARUMUGHAM.— I am highly obliged to the Hon. Minister for saying that. It is a disrespect to the highest order of judiciary.

Therefore we press for a thorough discussion on this and a reply from the Government as to what exactly has happened and whether the Government propose to take any action against the organisers.

2-00 P.M.

SRI K.H. RANGANATH.— I expressed a personal opinion. Let it go on record.

SRI C.M. ARMUGHAM.—I am all the more obliged. Therefore we can discuss after hearing from the minister. What action the Government propose to take against the organisers and what action the Government has already taken. These are the two points on which I would like to hear from the Minister before we discuss further on the subject.

ಶ್ರೀ ಹಾರ್ಲಿ ರಾಮಸ್ವಾಮಿ.— ಸಭಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ನಾನು ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿರತಕ್ಕದ್ದು. ಈ ವಿಷಯ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದದ್ದೋ ಅಥವಾ ಅಲ್ಲವೇ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವಿಗಾದರೂ ಈ ತರಹ ಆದರೆ, ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಕೈ ಹಾಕುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಿಯಮದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲವೇ ? ಇಂಥ ಘಟನೆಗಳು ಆದರೆ, ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಯಾವಂತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನು ಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇಂಥ ಘಟನೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಬೇರೊಬ್ಬರ ಮೇಲೆ ಆಪಾದನೆಯಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ವಿಷಯ ನಿಜವಾದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಹೇಳಿಕೆ ಇದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅವರು ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ತಪ್ಪು ಅಲ್ಲವೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಹೇಳಿಕೆ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆಯೇ ನಾನು ಅವರು ತಪ್ಪು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ತಯಾರು ಇಲ್ಲ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಸಭೆಗೆ ಈ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ತಾವು ಸೂಚನೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೀರಾ ?

† SRI L.G. HAVANUR.—Sir, the question that has been raised by the hon. member Sri H. Ramaswamy under rule 63 has been referred to me just now. On listening to the discussion I found that under rule 36 (2) (j) the right to ask a question is governed by the fact that :
“it shall not relate to a matter which is not the concern of the Government.”

My department has also opined that it was a private function and the Government as such need not answer the question. However, since the Hon. Speaker has asked me to make a statement I proceed to state that I was present at the time when the centenary celebration of Holenarasipur Magistrate's court was conducted. I was President of the celebration. The allegation of the hon. member Sri C. M. Arumugham namely the act of not welcoming His Lordship Mr. Justice K. Bhimaiah, may not be construed to be a deliberate act because there was a lot of confusion in the function. The President of the Centenary Celebrations Committee might have inadvertently omitted to welcome Mr. Justice Bhimaiah. It is possible to infer that Mr. Justice Bhimaiah being a member of the Scheduled Caste who had been subjected to all sorts of humiliation and insinuation on the ground of his caste was discriminated. Our Hindu society is such that although a man belonging to the lower caste occupies the highest position either in politics or any professions like engineering, medicine including judiciary, he carries his caste with him and he is looked down upon by others as inferior. In fact Justice Bhimaiah felt very much that day who was sitting to my right side, very close to me. When his name was not referred in the welcome speech I asked him whether he was at all invited. He pushed an invitation card on

which his name was printed. Indeed, the attitude of the organisers of the function had hurt the feelings of Justice Bhimaiah as also my feelings and Justice Bhimaiah made a speech about the cast system in the Hindu society and the discrimination that is made against the lower caste. I too made a similar speech. I repeat that the omission on the part of the organisers to make a mention of Justice Bhimaiah in the welcome speech was not deliberate.

S. MALLIKARJUNA KHARGE.—May I know at least at the time of vote of thanks they regretted for the act?

SRI C.M. ARUMUGHAM.—May I know whether he was garlanded with other Judges and the Hon. Minister were garlanded?

SRI L.G. HAVANUR.—Of course, there was garlanding.

SRI C.M. ARUMUGHAM.—Was it at the same time?

SRI L.G. HAVANUR.—Garlanding cannot take place Simultaneously for all.

SRI C.M. ARUMUGHAM.—Is it a fact that all were garlanded and he was neglected and when somebody asked he was garlanded?

SRI L.G. HAVANUR.—So far as that aspect is concerned I was not attentive.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTERS OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

reg : Clashes between landlords and harijans over occupancy rights at Appaswamanapalli Chintamani Taluk.

SRI CHOWDA REDDY (Chitamani).— I call the attention of the Minister for Rural Development and Panchayati Raj to the sudden clashes between the landlords and poor Harijans at Appaswamanapalli, Mittahalli Panchayat, Chillalery Hobli, Chintamani Taluk about occupancy rights on lands.

SRI K. PRABHAKAR (Minister for Rural Development and Panchayatraj).—I wish to make the following statement :

In Appasamanahalli village of Chintamani taluk, 30 guntas of lands was acquired for Harijan colony in Sl. Nos. 1/2, 2/1, 2/2 and 2/3 during the year 1962. After completion of the acquisition proceedings, the records were sent to the Assistant Superintendent of Land Records for phodi work. These records have been lost in his office and not traced so far. The Tahasildar, Chintamani taluk inspected the spot and conducted enquiries which reveal that though the land was acquired and given possession to the Village Panchayats the Land continues to be under the enjoyment of the land-lords and they are raising dry